VOL. 61 NO 101 THREE CENTS
MONTREAL THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1972

McGILL DAILY

DEPOT LEGAL BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE
POSTAGE PAID IN CASH AT 3RD CLASS POSTAGE RATE PERMIT NO. 11024
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED AT 3480 McTAVISH, MONTREAL.

Council picks Denton in 8-7 secret ballot

Group to fight for open Daily

by andrew phillips

Over 125 students met immediately after last night's Student Council debacle and decided unanimously to begin organizing resistance against Council's decision to reject Nesar Ahmad as next year's Daily editor. The students had formed the great majority of the audience that witnessed the student councillors' appointment of law student Timothy Denton by a one vote margin in the second of two secret ballots.

A committee has been formed to support the staff of the McGill Daily and the staff choice for Editor, Nesar Ahmad, in their just struggle to uphold the principles of staff democracy and an open Daily. Anyone interested in aiding the committee is asked to come to the Daily office at 10 a.m. for an organizational meeting.

Nesar Ahmad, who was nominated by this year's Daily staff, denounced the councillor's behavior: "They have no respect for the opinions of students. They called a group like this 'monolithic' and got scared of it."

He charged the meeting was characterized by "the worst kind of manoeuvres and the worst kind of red-baiting", and called for all the students to publicize the decision and mobilize support for the principle of an open Daily.

Marlen Dixon, a sociolgy professor supporting Ahmad, described a meeting she and other faculty members had yesterday with Students' Society President Gabor Zinner at which "he made it clear that he supported Denton and wanted the Daily to, as he put it, 'help him fulfill his mission of keeping the Students' Society from falling apart.'"

Pointing out that a campus newspaper "affects faculty and students alike", Dixon said that she and other faculty members "had every confidence in Neser and thought that the Daily staff would be able to put together a first-rate open paper in the fall."

continued on page 3

PSF meeting

There will be an urgent meeting of the Popular Student Front today at 6 p.m. for all members and supporters. Purpose of the meeting is to discuss the Students' Council action regarding the McGill Daily editorship. Place will be posted on the door of the Daily office.



TIMOTHY DENTON, Council's choice for Daily editor, gestures victoriously as the result of last night's vote is announced. Supporters of defeated Daily staff candidate Nesar Ahmad look on in disgust. Seated below, Myron Galloway and Gabor Zinner study the result.

Zinner-Lantos 'contract' Daily

The Students' Society last night laid down specific guidelines for the operation of the McGill Daily in adopting a 14-point contract which future editors of the Daily must sign. The contract was written by Students' Society president Gabor Zinner and Post-Graduate Students' Society representative Robert Lantos.

In introducing the contract, Zinner said that it merely clarifies the clause in the constitution giving the Students' Society jurisdiction over the paper.

"We must ensure that the Daily best serves the needs of the student body," said Zinner. "It must be made relevant and worthwhile to everyone, not just to a select clique."

He warned that this type of action is necessary because of threats of secession within the Society. Several professional faculties have recently discussed pulling out.

"Unless we want to witness the disintegration of the Society, the Daily has to become a mechanism for uniting it into a via-

continued on page 3

In a five hour marathon session last night, Council elected Timothy Denton as editor of the next year's McGill Daily over the Daily's staff choice, Nesar Ahmad, by a one vote margin.

The vote, which was taken by secret ballot, yielded eight votes for Denton, seven for Ahmad, and two spoiled ballots. The decision to vote by secret ballot was loudly opposed by the two hundred students attending the meeting.

Students' Society President Gabor Zinner was able to vote under the secret ballot. Had the vote been open he would only have been able to vote in the case of a tie.

After four hours of heated debate between Council and the two candidates, climaxed by thirty minutes of statements from the audience, the Councillors tried to come to a decision.

Engineering representatives Barry Hoodem and Jim Fong moved that Council reject both candidates and extend applications for the Daily editorship. They proposed that this be done by "Public Address" next week, and that the candidates be announced by Public Address a week later. The motion was carried by a vote of 8 to7, with Robert Lantos abstaining.

Nigel Gibson's request for a revote was granted by Zinner, who said: "In order to avoid being labelled as a bureaucrat, I'm going to permit a revote."

The revote ended in a tie, with Steve Strasser, Law representative, joining Lantos on the abstention list. Zinner broke the tie by voting against the motion. "That means that we'll decide tonight," he said.

A motion was then made to reconsider the defeat of the previous motion calling for the extension. Gibson opposed the reconsideration, saying: "We've had enough of this bureaucratic bullshit. Let's get on with it."

The motion to reconsider was defeated by one vote, with Lantos abstaining again.

Gibson then proposed "that Nesar Ahmad be ratified as editor for the year 1972-73". A motion to vote by secret ballot was passed with 5 against and one abstention.

Before the ballots were cast, however, Medicine representative Marcus Martin stated that

continued on page 3

by liz willick
president, canadian university press

The "contract" and freedom of the press

Last night your student council passed a motion which established a contract to be signed by the editor of the McGill daily upon taking office.

This contract, they said, would merely elaborate on the article in the Students' Society constitution allowing it to "manage and control" the Daily through its editor-in-chief.

As long as student councils control the purse strings of student newspapers, they will retain for themselves the power to hire and fire the editor.

But, if the paper is to be more than a house organ for a self-counscious non-representative (check the percentage of his constituency your "representative" got in his election), then the power of the student council publisher must go no farther. Riders on the freedom of the press are simply riders on the freedom of the press and cannot be justified by the argument that they do not alter items of the constitution.

I have worked on a newspaper. I will work on a newspaper again. For the past two years I have been a bureaucrat in a national student newspaper organization. Here are some of the implications I see in that "innocuous" contract, so hastily drawn up and passed by your representatives.

Article 1: The editorial opinions! of any individual cannot be abstracted from what he writes. If a writer is honest with himself and respects his own beliefs and perceptions, that 'bias' must be clearly reflected in all he writes. In that case who is to decide what constitutes 'editorial opinion'? This clause can be used to directly control style and content of the major portion of the paper. How will it be used Will the consumer ideology of our society come under fire through the banishing of ads from all but the 'editorial' page?

Article 2: Is liberal pluralism not an ideology a viewpoint – too? Would a paper presenting a hodge-podge of unrelated articles in a hodge-podge of styles be a very useful or informative paper? Would it help you to understand what happens in your university or your world?

Article 3: Can campus events be comprehended in isolation? Won't campus events come to be defined as student council and student council approved activities?

Article 4: A newspaper cannot print everything that comes into it's office – for reasons of space, content, and style. Who will decide when a decision to reject an article was made by the right people based on the right criteria from the council's point of view?

Article 5: Just what the hell does "deliberate misrepresentation" mean? No-one connected with newspapers goes looking for law suits. If the paper sees fit to criticize a sutdent council president, is this more likely to be labelled a "personal vendetta" than anything else?

Article 6: Advertising supplies about 30 to 60 percent of the content of most newspapers. Control over what ads are accepted and the rates should be left as far as is possible within the necessary financial considerations, to the people who determine the content of the rest of the paper.

Article 7: The byline policy on any paper should be determined by the staff of that paper. Although a permanent byline policy might be advisable in helping the readership to understand the bias of that papers' writers, there are often good reasons why reporters do not wish to see their names printed. Just as journalists should have the right not to disclose their sources in many cases, papers should have the right not to disclose the authorship of every word it prints. And besides, bylines take up a lot space.

Article 8: If one person can not get along with the majority of the Daily staff, can he or she cry 'political discrimination' to Council? Or how will council know if 'political discrimination' exists? Are they going to judge whether staff members are accepted politically or based on 'competence or excellence'? Does that mean someone without newspaper experience and therefore probably lacking in 'competence and excellence' should not be admitted to the Daily staff?

Article 9: This is the most blatant example of editorial control and censorship. Censorship can also worlk by imposing certain types of content from above as well as by not allowing other types of content to be printed. The students council wants a house organ to serve its interests; not a newspaper which attempts to serve the in- [illegible] of the students.

Article 10: Surely neither of the two people who wrote this document can ever have worked on a student newspaper. I do not believe that there is a single member of CUP (almost 60 paper) which could deliver a guarantee of appearing on campus at a specified morning hour.

Article 11: Why should council evaluate the student newspaper? Isn't that at least one of the questions on which you should be directly consulted?

Article 12: Allows for the continuous harassement of Daily editors and staff based on subjective interpretations of the all the generalities presented in this ridiculous document.

Article 13: The Daily belongs to the Students' Society. What is the Students' Society? The bureaucrats around a council table? It's a lot easier for the average student to get involved with the Daily than it is with the student council.

Article 13: "Self-perpetuating cliques" on student newspapers have in the past often been justified in such terms as 'continuity' 'a learning growing process', 'consitency'. It all depends on how you look at it. Who decides when how and the clique exists (What is students' council?) and whether its existence is negative or positive in terms of the results as personified in the paper?

Article 14: Well, you've got it before you now. What do you think? Does it give you a better idea of what to expect from next year's Daily or what to expect from next year's Council?

In many ways the contract is trivial, superfluous, and journalisticly speaking, ridiculous. On the other hand, it cannot be ignored because of the principles behind it, the precedents it sets and the mis-placed egotism that motivated it.

The decision to accept this contract is also consistent with council's later decision to appoint as Editor-in-chief of the Daily a man who has not worked with the Daily. The support of the majority of students concerned enough to attend the meeting for Nesar Ahmad did not sway their decision any more than the unanimous vote of the Daily staff for Ahmad. Yet Ahmad, I am told, recieved more votes from the 46 staff members than some councillors did from their constituencies.

Do these supercilious bureaucrats really represent you?

CONTRACT BETWEEN THE STUDENTS' COUNCIL OF McGILL UNIVERSITY and THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF OF THE McGILL DAILY 1972-1973

The Editor of the McGill Daily agrees to abide by all of the following clauses during the year 1972-1973.

1. The McGILL DAILY will refrain from voicing editorial opinions on the front page, in news items, or anywhere else for that matter except for the page(s) specifically all otted for editorial material and labelled as such.

2. The contents of the paper – in terms of issues covered and emphasis, must reflect the plurality and divergence of interests and views of the ENTIRE McGill Community.
The DAILY must not and will not be an instrument to be used for the propagation of any one ideology or viewpoint to the exclusion of others.

3. The primary role of McGILL DAILY is to disseminate and discuss information about campus events. This is the reason why it is subsidized by its publisher, the McGill Students' Society. Campus-related events must take precedence over all other material instead of receiving only incidental attention. Furthermore, the space and exposure allotted to all events must be proportionate to their size, import and interest.

4. In addition to campus activities, it is vital that the DAILY examine and expose issues of a wider social, political and cultural nature – without ever stifling or repressing contributions for political reasons.

5. No deliberate misrepresentation of news and events will be tolerated. Character slurs, libel and personal vendettas, gross political partiality in reporting, and undue emphasis on any one group or organization constitute an intolerable abuse of the newspaper's facilities.

6. There will be NO FREE ADVERTISING whatsoever given to any group or organization, beyond the TODAY COLUMN, which exists for that purpose. The DAILY Editor and staff will not permit any such ads to appear in the paper.

7. All newstories must carry a byline (except in extraordinary circumstances) clearly identifying the author.

8. There will be no political discrimination in the appointment of staff. Recognizing that all McGill students obligatorily contribute to the financing of the Daily and that an entire spectrum of interests and views prevails on this campus, all individuals desiring to contribute to the production of the DAILY should be welcome to do so. The only acceptable criteria for the selection of staff are competence and excellence.

9. Apart from the regular coverage, a weekly column should be reserved for the Students' Society and the various graduate and undergraduate societies for communication with the student body.

10. The DAILY must appear at 10 a.m. every morning and it must be delivered to all locations throughout the university.

11. A review date of October 30, 1972 at the latest be established for the Students' Council to evaluate the over-all performance of the DAILY up to that time.

12. If at that time (or any other time), it is the view of the Students' Council that a serious infraction of anv of the terms stipulated in this contract has occured that shall constitute sufficient grounds for the immediate dismissal of the Editor, who is, accordng to the Students' Society Constitution, DIRECTLY responsible to the Council.

13. The Editor of the McGILL DAILY recognizes:

a) Article 8, clause 6 of the Students' Society Constitution in its full import.

b) That the McGILL DAILY is financed and supported by the Students' Society and therefore, belongs to the Students' Society and NOT to the staff of the DAILY.

c) That, as is the case with the publishers of any newspaper in this world, the supreme authority regarding consequential decisions, such as the firing of the Editor, rests with the publisher, in this case, the Students' Society as represented by its elected governing body, the Students' Council, and as specified in the Constitution.

d) That the university is not an unchanging community, but on the contrary, a place where there is an influx of newcomers every year, and that therefore, the McGILL DAILY must make every effort not only to accept, but indeed to attract new staff members every year. That the DAILY be open to all students and not be the organ of a self-perpetuating clique.

14. The Editor of the McGILL DAILY undertakes to publish this contract in full in the first issue of next year's newspaper in order to inform students about what they can legitimately expect from the DAILY of the coming year and what their rights are regarding participation in its production.

Signed: Editor-In-Chief, McGill Daily, 1972-1973

Council...

continued from page 1

the fact that Nesar Ahmad was the "most capable" candidate was unfortunate because of what he termed "the colgate barrier" of the audience.

In the first secret ballot, there were seven votes for Denton, seven for Ahmad, two marked "screw it", and one missing ballot.

The second time round, 8 councillors voted for Denton, seven for Ahmad, and two spoiled their ballots.

The students in the audience then shouted for an open vote. One person called for an immediate meeting of "all students who want a free and open Daily". Councillors decided to adjourn the meeting and began to leave the room.

At this point, Nesar Ahmad said: "I don't see why Gabby wouldn't call an open vote. This meeting was a deliberate attempt to get rid of me as editor. Those of you who are here and have supported me know that you don't come from a monolithic group. Let's discuss what we can do."

The students moved quickly into the ballroom to hold an emergency meeting.

Group...

continued from page 1

Describing Council's action as "a deliberate act of political repression", she accused Zinner of manipulating the procedures by using the device of secret ballotprposed by Engineering rep Barry Hoodem—which allowed him to vote, to tip the balance against Ahmad. Without this device, she pointed out, "Nesar would have won even on Council."

Nigel Gibson, an Arts representative on Council and a Daily staffer, said that the councillors "made no pretence of being democratic."

"We played by their rules and we lost," he continued. "It's been useful because now we know the enemy."

Bob Wallace, this years Associate Editor, urged students to "campaign on the issue of an open paper, and form an organized opposition to demand that Zinner justify himself before the world or retreat behing Robert's Rules of Order."

"It's clear from the way Council operated," he continued, "that the last thing they wanted was to have to justify their decision to the students on the basis of rational argument. They wanted to act as people who bureaucratically organize the garbage events that Zinner is always wanting the Daily to publicize."

Present Daily editor Tom Sorell called for all students present to help organize opposition and take part in putting out a special newpaper saying "we can put the principle of openness hat we fought for into practice."

Many students came to the Daily offices after the meeting ended at 1 am to discuss strategy in opposing Council.

Doug Amos, presidential candida for the Popular Student Front in the last Students' Society election, and Will Hoffman of the Debating Union, were among others who underlined the students determination to fight the Denton appointment by mobilizing student opinion in the next few days.

"This thing cuts away at every freedom of the press," charged Hoffman.

Over 70 of the students at the meeting later declared their willingness to participate in a campaign supporting the Daily staff's choice for editor.

Contract...

continued from page 1

ble organism.

He then made a detailed criticism of this year's **Daily**. He charged that it had neglected the coverage of campus events, and had failed to observe a distinction between reporting and editorializing. He also maintained that it mismanaged funds and promoted a monolithic political ethos.

This criticism was not intended to prejudice Council against the **Daily** staff's choice for editor, Zinner added.

"It is only by explicitly establishing such firm conditions and parameters that the Students' Society can re-establish its authority over the **Daily**," said Zinner.

Arts representative Nigel Gibson then objected that Council was not allowing the students any time to discuss the issue.

"How do you propose to communicate with the students at this late date?" asked Graduate Studies representative Robert Lantos, who had co-authored the contract with Zinner.

"That's your problem," replied Gibson. "Since you waited this long, then you're obviously in the wrong."

Daily editor Tom Sorell then requested that the editorial candidates be allowed to speak on the contract before it was put to a vote. After some discussion, Council agreed to let the candidates participate.

Nesar Ahmad warned council against making a hasty decision on the contract. "Certain ethics in journalism are involved here, such as the right of any newspaper to autonomy," he said. The crowd greeted these remarks with loud cheering.

Lantos replied that the purpose of the contract was to allow Council to oversee more closely the operation of the **Daily**, but that there would be no attempt at direct editorial control.

Tim Denton came out strongly in favour of the contract. "He who pays the piper calls the tune." he said. "You're fucking paying for a **Daily**, so you should get what you pay for."

He warned that the Students' Society is on the verge of dissolution "It's trying to save itself from impending doom," he said.

Gibson then pointed out that the contract unavoidably reinforces the notion of political control over the newspaper. "This notion is already more or less expressed in the constitution, but let's not come out in open support of it."

Ron Colpitts, national field secretary for the Canadian University Press, was given the floor at the request of several councillors. The **Dailly** is a member paper of CUP.

"You may be the Daily's publisher, but you're also a major source of news." Colpitts told Council. "This dichotomy changes your role as publisher. You should restrict yourself to the hiring and firing of the editor."

Colpitts added that objectivism is a myth, since there is a bias to every news story. "How do you arbitrate whether a story is biased or unbiased—especially if the story is about you?" he asked.

The contract in effect puts Council in a position of direct control over the paper, he said, so that the paper could easily become a house organ of the Students' Society.

A clause in the Daily's contract with CUP stipulates that the paper must not fall under the direct control of any student government. "I think this contract comes very close to contravening this clause, "warned Colpitts. "In fact, I think that it does."

Statement from Canadian University Press

Student Council last night approved a potentially dangerous and restrictive contract to be signed by the Daily editor and appointed Timothy Denton as editor-in-chief.

These actions contravene the standing resolutions of the constitution of Canadian University Press, of which the Daily is a member.

The following paragraphs of the Statement of Principles of the English student press in Canada and Quebec have been contravened:

- That the Canadian student press should be free from pressure by student governments, university authorities, or any other external agencies, whether or not the press is part of such an organization, except for the extraordinary power of removing the editor, which should reside only in the authority which appoon ted him or her.
- That in no case should a representative or representatives of the student government or administration have the explicit or implied power of censorhip or the power to set editorial or advertising policies.
- That the editor of the student newspaper should be selected by the staff of the student newspaper.
- That overall policy decisions should be made through collective discussion by the staff, whenever possible.

The members of the Canadian University Press, a co-operative and the only national student organization in the country, agree, in becoming members, to abide by the Statement of Principles.

Such flagrant abuse of the principles of freedom of the press and staff control by council will mean in effect, that the Daily is no longer a free newspaper. Just as the administration-controlled papers are not admitted to CUP, neither are student council controlled papers.

Under the editorship of Denton and the control of the Students' Society, it is likely that the membership of the 35th national CUP conference at Christmas will determine that the Daily is not eligible for membership in Canadian University Press or for the news and features service and the communications links it provides.

Ed Reed
Ron Colpitts
Liz Willick
for the National Executive
Canadian University Press

Statement from Amateur Radio

Amateur Radio supports Nesar Ahmad for the editor of the McGill Daily on the principle that the staff's recommendation should be of prime importance and that he is much more qualified than Mr. Denton.

David Weiner
Predident, Amateur Radio

Statement from Radio McGill

Excerpt from the minutes of the Radio McGill general staff meeting, March 15, 1972.

re: item 03: Support for the McGill Daily Staff Democracy

Mr. Nigel Gibson requested that Radio McGill support the principle of staff democracy in the choice of the 'McGill Daily' editor as well as in the day-to-day operation of the newspaper.

It was moved by M. Altmejd, and seconded by M. Charland that Radio McGill accept Mr. Gibson's request.

The motion was carried with one (1) abstention.

Michael Higgs, Chairman
Patricia German, Secretary

Statement from Old McGill '72

The following members of Old McGill '72 support the principle of staff democracy and staff autonomy in the choice of the Daily Editor and therefore strongly condemn Council's action last night.

Jean-Michel Joffe
Laurie Breger
Harold Rosenberg
Nigel Gibson
Mary Rozestraten
Linda Feldman
Patricia Sargent

NOTE

REFLECTIONS OF A NON-MARXIST, NON-MAOIST, NON-APATHETIC STUDENT

This past year I ran on a humourous platform (remember the Metis Liberation Front?) I thought that student politics as it existed on our campus was meaningless. I was wrong: it is insidious! Councillors are elected to represent the views of students. I thought that the impotence and inaction displayed by Council reflected the views of the majority of the students. If students are apathetic, councillors should be inactive. However, last night, as one of the 200 students who witnessed the circus called Council, I learned that Councillors are not inactive. They are corrupt, cowardly, self-seeking and afraid of students. After five hours of discussion, monologues, yelling and burps, Council decided to vote for editor by SECRET BALLOT! Councillors are elected to represent us, you and me. We are entitled to know how they represent us and how they vote. Why did they refuse to vote publicly on such an important issue? Are they afraid of students? Why are they afraid of us? Do they have something to hide?

Steve D. Cohen

Statements of support for an open Daily

Statement from the Gateway

Gateway, the official student newspaper of the University of Alberta, today telexed the following message supporting staff democracy in selecting an editor:

. "The staff of the Gateway strongly support the staff of the McGill Daily in their struggle to have their own choice of editor.

"The staff of a student newspaper, because they work on the paper, and know the workings of the paper and the job of editor and will be working with whoever is chosen, should have the major voice in determining each year's editor.

"Students' Council, who do not work on the paper and who know relatively little about the paper's operation, have littler right to interfere with the staff's choice."

STATEMENT FROM THE CHEVRON (UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO)

While the **Chevron** staff is ignorant of the background of the **Daily**-Council dispute we must confirm the principle of staff autonomy in choosing its own structure and personnel. Student government interference in these decisions is not a new occurence; it must be fought both by the newspaper staffs and persons inside student governments who realize the danger of this interference. Good luck.

STATEMENT FROM THE VARSITY (UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)

The assembled masses of the Varsity staff have just voted solidarity with the Daily in your just struggles against an imperialist Students' Council. We wish good luck and struggle in this thing.

STATEMENT FROM A.S.U.S. CONCERNING COUNCIL DECISION

The Executive of the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society condemns in the strongest possible terms the deceitful and manipulative actions of Student Council last night.

Student Council dropped all pretext of democratic procedure, disregarded the clearly stated views of the students at the meeting, avoided in a cowardly manner openly stating their views, and indulged in the most disgusting practice of red-baiting.

Council refused to deal with the question of the competence of the two candidates; and instead passed a so-called contract which amounted to repression of freedom of the press. Few Council members openly supported either candidate, and they refused to even face the students openly by finally deciding the question with a secret ballot.

The ultimate result of Council's action – the firing of the complete Daily staff and suppression of an open Daily – cannot be tolerated by McGill students. The Arts and Science Undergraduate Society supports the concept of an open, democraic Daily and remains in full support of Nesar Ahmad for Daily Editor. McGill students must not allow the small clique of bureaucratic hacks known as "Students' Councillors" to make a mockery of democracy.

Statement of the A.S.U.S. Executive Concerning The McGill Daily

The Executive of the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society of McGill University endorses and fully supports the selection of Nesar Ahmad as editor of the McGill Daily.

Mr. Ahmad is the only candidate with the journalistic experience and the ability to attract a competent, committed staff necessary to produce a good Daily.

The choice of Nesar Ahmad is the only principled choice which the Students' Society Executive can make. Any other action would be anti-democratic and reflect a lack of respect for the principle of staff democracy established this year, and could only be considered a threat to free journalism.

Gary Ticoll, President
Perry Shearwood, Treasurer
John Man waring, Arts' Vice-President
Robert Maklan, Secreatary
Paula Fainstat, E1 Representative
Anna-Lee Yassi, E2 Representative
Ann Kerr, U1 Representative
Bill Worrell, 4th Year Representative

STATEMENT FROM CONCERNED FACULTY

A university newspaper is an important determinant of the intellectual atmosphere and vitality of the whole university community and therefore of interest to faculty and students alike. Therefore we, the undersigned faculty, would like to take this opportunity to urge Students' Council to respect freefom of the press, particularly dissenting press, and to ratify the duly elected candidate of the **Daily** staff, Nesar Ahmad.

Immanuel Wallerstein
Philip Ehrensaft
Pauline Vaillancourt
Marlene Dixon
George Benello
Malcolm Spector
Hal Sarf
Sid Ingerman
Bruce Garside
Peter S. Sindell
John Southin
Jeremy Walker

Statement of ISA executive

Dear President and Council Members,

In view of the upcoming elections for Editor of the McGill Daily, the executive of the International Students Association has received a concensus of sympathy and support for Nesar Amhad as Daily editor, with letters of support being submitted to the executives by,

African Students' Society,
Chinese Students' Society
Iranian Students' Association
Italian Students' Society
Hellenic Club
Polish-Canadian Students' Association
West-Indian Students' Association
Arab Students' Society
Hanusia Korwin-Lapuszanska
Vice-President

STATEMENT FROM THE I.S.A. EXECUTIVE

The executive and members of Student Council:

On behalf of the International Students' Association, and its executive, we would like to express to you our support for the election of Nesar Ahmad as the editor of the **McGill Daily.** In the last few years, Mr. Nesar Ahmad, who is a foreign student himself has, in our opinion, played an active role not only in serving the foreign students, but the student community at McGill at large. We believe that during this period both as a contributor to the **Daily** as well as in other capacities. Mr. Ahmad has taken a just, rational, and progressive stand. He is one of the few people in the **McGill Daily** whom we know who has paid attention to the issues facing students on local, national, and international levels without taking a sectarian view in favor of any small section.

As far as we remember, the **Daily** has not had the benefit, for a long time, of having as its editor an Asian who has been familiar with diverse experiences, and the appointment of such a person will be a definite step towards making the **McGill Daily** fulfil the task of a student paper in the present-day world.

Alice Adrianow
President, I.S.A.
Hanusia Korwin-Lopuszanska
Vice-president, I.S.A.

STATEMENT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE DEBATING UNION

Dear Councillors,

Once again the position of Daily editor is open and once again we find ourselves, students and councillors alike, taking sides in McGill's most infamous annual event-the Daily fight. I am compelled by past experience and present knowledge to choose the side of the Daily. My interests and the interests of the organization I represent are in the continued viability of a newspaper – not a university rag – but a newspaper.

More is at stake in your decision than the personalities, political views and qualifications of the candidates for editor, though even on these grounds my experience with the two applicants gives support to Nesar Ahmad. Of the two, he clearly displays a greater ability to work with his fellow students in a student organization, a more serious and more stable outlook on political and social issues, and a greater administrative capability. Still, beyond that, fullest consideration must be given to the continuity of a growing entity – the McGill Daily. This newspaper is not a toy to be volleyed about from year to year, especially when such trades appear more as shifts from competent leadership to incompetent rather than from left wing to right wing.

You must take into account what the Daily has become and who has been responsible for its development. Over the past year the Daily has been recognized as the best Canadian university newspaper, both in content and in layout, it now supports a viable alternative news service both across Canada and in Quebec, and its internal organization is developing into a true participatory democracy with a detailed and written policy statement.

The paper may not yet be perfect by standards of campus acclamation but these reflect growing pains more than direct reflections on policy or political outlook. In my own view the Daily this year, far from being unreadable, is the only Daily I've been able to read with some interest.

The Daily is a paper which has proved itself capable of response; it is not representative of an editor who promises outright "change" of policy to God-knows-what without stating lines of feedback. Already this year we've seen changes in the coverage of campus stories in response to both the wishes of council and the complaints of the general student populace.

With continuity of policy (not politics, but a paper of readership response, staff democracy and newspaper quality) and the growth of a university institution of import in mind I urge you to vote for the Daily candidate. The alternative offers only change which destroys what has been built and deprives council and students of the feedback they now have.

Michael O'Neill Montgomery
President,
McGill Debating Union

Statement from David Weiner, Internal Vice-President Elect

Little remains to be said about Council's actions. Council Playbabies, through their customary bureaucratic techniques, have appointed a man having no intellectual credentials, for whom everything is a "non-happening".

It is regrettable that they violated the principles of staff democracy, and contravened those of the Canadian University Press. The executive has succeeded in appointing the ideal hack, a man with no direction... a cynic, one who will glorify the policies of the present executive. That they could ignore statements of support from a large number of major student organizations must nullify any claims that this Council is "representative" of student opinions.

The only clear solution to this problem would have been to take it to the students; rather, they transformed themselves into a Secret Society, because Council members were afraid or unable to account for their individual decisions to the students. With a working staff of eight, Mr. Denton should produce an excellent gossip sheet, at the same time saving us, as he says, "from impending doom."